

## **REMARKS**

The specification is objected to. Claims 1, 4, 5, 10, 13, 14, 16, 21-24, and 28-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over US Publication 2005/0263591 by Smith (hereinafter Smith) in view of US Patent 6,570,884 to Connery et al. (hereinafter Connery) in further view of US Publication 2002/0107966 by Baudot et al. (Baudot).

Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephone interview of October 8, 2008. We discussed the present invention and a proposed amendment. Applicants agreed to submit the amendment and do so with this response.

### **Response to objections to the specification**

The specification is objected to for not defining “computer readable medium.” Applicants have amended claims 16 and 21-23 to be directed to “A program of executable code stored on a storage device and executed by a processor...” The amendment is well supported by the specification. See page 7, ¶ 29-30. Applicants submit that the specification fully supports the claims as amended.

### **Amendments to the Claims**

Applicants have amended claim 1 with the limitation “...wherein an invalid interface address is selected from an address outside of a specified address range assigned to a manufacturer ...” The amendment is well supported by the specification. See page 13, ¶ 54. Claims 10, 16, 24, and 30 are similarly amended.

Claim 16 is amended with the limitation “...query an interface address of an interface device in communication with a network...” The amendment is well supported by the specification. See page 10, ¶ 44; fig. 3, ref. 310. Claims 24 and 30 are similarly amended.

#### Response to rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4, 5, 10, 13, 14, 16, 21-24, and 28-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Smith in view of Connery in further view of Baudot. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 16 includes the limitations:

“...query an interface address of an interface device in communication with a network, wherein the interface address is an Ethernet media access controller address of an Ethernet network interface card;

receive the interface address;

determine whether the interface address is invalid, **wherein the invalid interface address is selected from an address outside of a specified address range assigned to a manufacturer** and an address not of a specified device; and **mitigate the invalid interface address by deactivating the network.**”

Emphasis added.

Independent claims 1, 10, 24, and 30 include similar limitations. Applicants submit that the combination of Smith, Connery, and Baudot do not disclose an invalid address being an address outside of a specified address range assigned to a manufacturer and mitigating the invalid interface address by deactivating the network.

Smith teaches erasing and programming of the tags for mitigating invalid addresses. Smith, page 11, ¶ 131, 133; page 12, ¶ 138. However, Smith does not disclose an invalid address being an address outside of a specified address range *assigned to a manufacturer*. Connery and Baudot also do not disclose this limitation.

The Examiner asserts that Baudot discloses mitigating the invalid interface address by deactivating the network by teaching replicating a status from an active process to a standby process, then transferring a connection to the standby process and closing the active process. Baudot, page 1, ¶ 10; fig. 4. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In Baudot, either the active process or the standby process connects to the network. Baudot, page 1, ¶ 10. However, the network is not deactivated. See for example Baudot, page 2, ¶ 24; page 3, ¶ 37-41; fig. 1, ref 300; fig. 4. Applicants therefore submit that Baudot does not disclose mitigating the invalid interface address by deactivating the network. Smith and Connery also do not disclose this limitation.

Because Smith, Connery, and Baudot do not disclose each element of the claimed invention, Applicants submit that claims 1, 10, 16, 24, and 30 as amended are allowable. Applicants further submit that claims 4, 5, 13, 14, 21-23, 28, and 29 are allowable as depending from allowable claims.

### Conclusion

As a result of the presented remarks, Applicants assert that the application is in condition for prompt allowance. Should additional information be required regarding the traversal of the

rejections of the claims enumerated above, Examiner is respectfully asked to notify Applicants of such need. If any impediments to the prompt allowance of the claims can be resolved by a telephone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian C. Kunzler/

Brian C. Kunzler  
Reg. No. 38,527  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: October 24, 2008  
8 East Broadway, Suite 600  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111  
Telephone (801) 994-4646  
Fax (801) 531-1929